

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 are currently pending. No claims have been amended herewith.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement regarding the limitation “wherein fields in the data structure are different depending on the message type designation”; and Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,430,711 to Sekizawa (hereinafter “the ‘711 patent”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,015 to Smith et al. (hereinafter “the ‘015 patent”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In this regard, Applicants note that paragraph 122 of the specification states that:

[o]nce the message type has been determined, the data structure used to subsequently store the information in the subsequent lines of the email is defined. In the example discussed below, if the message type is *configuration information*, the data structure defined to store the information is DeviceInfo as specified in TABLE FOUR. If the message type is *status information*, the data structure defined to store the information is DeviceStatus as specified in TABLE FIVE.

See also Tables 4 and 5 referred to in paragraph 122, which are found on pages 63 and 65, respectively, of the specification. Tables 4 and 5 show different fields in the DeviceInfo and DeviceStatus data structures including the type of the field, the name of the field, and description of the field.

Moreover, it is self-evident that the fields in the data structure disclosed in paragraph 122 are different depending on the message type designation, as shown in Tables 4 and 5. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly know and understand that a data structure is generally comprised of one or more fields. The

word “fields” is commonly used by one of ordinary skill in the art to describe elements or subparts of data structures. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of receiving information concerning a remotely monitored device, the information being contained in a message that also includes a message type designation, the method comprising: (1) parsing a first line from the message to extract the message type designation, wherein the first line is the first line in the message; (2) determining a data structure type based on the message type designation; (3) creating a data structure of the determined data structure type in a memory, wherein fields in the created data structure are different depending on the message type designation; (4) parsing a second line from the message to extract a data type and a data value; and (5) storing the extracted data value in the data structure of the determined data structure type at a location in the memory corresponding to the extracted data type.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Office Action states that Claim 1 is rejected for “similar reasons as stated above.”<sup>1</sup> Presumably, the Office Action is referring to its rejection of Claim 5. In the rejection of Claim 5, the Office Action asserts that the ‘711 patent discloses everything in Claim 5 with the exception of reading a first line and reading a second line from a message, parsing the first line of the message to extract the message type designation, wherein the first line is the first line in the message, and returning the extracted message type designation to the receiver manager class, and relies on the ‘015 patent to remedy those deficiencies.

The ‘711 patent is directed to a system and method for monitoring the state of a plurality of network printers connected via a network. As shown in Figure 1, the ‘711 patent

---

<sup>1</sup> See page 6 of the outstanding Office Action.

discloses that an agent gets status information indicating the state of each network printer connected in a local area network from a network printer, and overwrites a status log data file with the obtained information. Further, the '711 patent discloses that each agent converts status information into an electronic mail and transmits the e-mail to a mail server. As shown in Figure 1, the '711 patent discloses that a console unit may access the mail server and read the e-mail related to the status of a network printer.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the '711 patent is primarily devoted to the sending of status information by an agent and is not directed to receiving and parsing information at a receiving device. As admitted in the Office Action, the '711 patent fails to disclose reading a first line and a second line of a received message, parsing the first line of the message to extract a message type designation, wherein the first line is the first line in the message, as recited in Claim 1. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that the '711 patent fails to disclose the steps of (1) parsing a first line from the message to extract the message type designation, wherein the first line is the first line in the message, (2) determining the data structure type based on the message type designation, (3) creating a data structure of the determined data structure type in a memory, wherein fields in the created data structure are different depending on the message type designation, (4) parsing a second line from the message to extract a data type and a data value, and (5) storing the extracted data value and the data structure of the determined data structure type at a location in the memory corresponding to the extracted data type, as recited in Claim 1. Rather, the '711 patent merely refers to extraction means for extracting status information from an electronic mail received by the electronic mail reception means.<sup>2</sup> However, the '711 patent does not disclose a method in which a step in the method depends on what is on the first line of a message containing information concerning a remotely monitored device, as recited in Claim 1.

---

<sup>2</sup> See '711 patent, col. 7, lines 5-7.

The '015 patent is directed to a system and method for monitoring a computer system process or peripheral. In particular, the '015 patent discloses a peripheral that comprises a network interface, a print engine, and a processor that controls the print engine in response to data received as an e-mail via an interface, and that sends an e-mail response via the interface. In particular, as shown in Figure 4, the '015 patent discloses that a list processor 232 includes several processes including parse-mail 414, direct-data-reporting-and-reconfiguration 424, symbol-report 426, and create-body 430. As described in column 13, the '015 patent discloses that the parse-mail process 414 monitors the contents of the mailbox bearing the address of the peripheral to determine from the body of the message whether to pass the message to the revised-access-control process 416, the revised-subscriber-list-process 420, or the direct-data-reporting-and-reconfiguration process 424.

However, Applicants note that the list processor 232 is operating on the printer 108 and is processing e-mail instructions sent to the printer. Accordingly, the parse-mail process is unrelated to receiving information concerning a remotely monitored device, as recited in Claim 1. Further, the parse-mail process 414 disclosed by the '015 patent does not parse a first line from the message to extract a message type designation, wherein the first line is the first line in the message, determine a data structure type based on the message type designation, and create a data structure of the determined data structure type in a memory, wherein fields in the created data structure are different depending on the message type designation, as recited in Claim 1. Rather, the parse-mail 414 process parses a received message *looking for commands to be executed by the printer*. Further, Applicants note that the Office Action has cited to column 14 of the '015 patent, which discusses the other various processes operating on list processor 232. In particular, column 14 discusses the assemble-report process 426, which receives, from time to time, notices of new values of state variables from process monitor 238 and organizes the new values into a report to be sent out from the

printer. Thus, the assemble-report process 426 is directed to assembling and creating a report or status email, rather than parsing and storing received information, as recited in Claim 1. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that the '015 patent fails to disclose parsing a second line from the message to extract a data type and a data value, and storing extracted data value in the data structure of the determined data structure type at a location in the memory corresponding to the extracted data type. Further, as stated above, the '015 patent fails to disclose parsing the first line from the message to extract a message type designation, when the first line is the first line in the message, and creating a data structure of the determined data structure type in a memory, wherein fields in the created data structure are different depending on the message type designation, as recited in Claim 1. Nowhere does the '015 patent state that the first line in a received message is of any importance. Moreover, the '015 patent is silent regarding creating a data structure, wherein fields in the created data structure are different depending on the message type designation, wherein the message type designation is extracted from a first line of a message, as required by Claim 1.

Accordingly, no matter how the teachings of the '717 and '015 patents are combined, the combination does not teach or suggest (1) parsing a first line from the message to extract a message type designation, wherein the first line is the first line in the message, (2) determining a data structure type based on the message type designation, (3) creating a data structure of the determined data structure type in a memory, wherein fields in the created data structure are different depending on the message type designation, (4) parsing a second line from the message to extract a data type and a data value, and (5) storing the extracted data value in the data structure of the determined data structure type at a location and the memory corresponding to the extracted data type, as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and that the rejection of Claim 1 (and dependent Claims 2 and 13-15) should be withdrawn.


Independent Claims 3, 5, and 9 recite limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, for reasons analogous to the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and that the rejection of Claims 3, 5, and 9 (and all associated dependent claims) should be withdrawn.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 3, 5, and 9 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over any proper combination of the '711 and '015 patents.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648  
Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 51,461

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
I:\ATTY\KMB\205850US-AF.DOC